

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of October 5, 2004. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-20** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ross (U.S. Pat. No. 5,465,213).

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a system comprising a printing device attached to a communication network where the printing device includes a control interface for allowing a user to select a document and cause the document to be retrieved from a remote device.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ross. Ross, however, is directly converse to claim 1. The printers (26, 28), as taught by Ross, are not capable of allowing a user to select a document and not capable of causing the document to be retrieved from a remote device. Rather, all user actions and selections are conducted within a customer console 36 (column 7, line 25, and lines 42-46). "Each customer console 36 is a stand alone unit..." (column 7, line 48). Ross clearly teaches that the customer console 36 is a separate device from the printers 26, 28 and thus, the printers do not have a control interface as recited in claim 1 and do not function as recited in claim 1. The same configuration is shown in the embodiment of Figure 3 and described by Ross in column 15, line 58 to column 16, line 55. Therefore, Ross fails to teach the recited features of claim 1 and the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection cannot be maintained.

Ross also fails to suggest the features of claim 1. There is no mention or consideration of having a printer (printers 26, 28, 147, 149) allow a user to select and retrieve a document from a

remote device. Indeed, all embodiments described by Ross function by having a customer console (36, 103) allow a user to select a book, a master microcomputer (18, 111) retrieves the data of the book, and then routes the data to the printer (28, 149) for printing (see column 7, line 25 to column 8, line 21). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to modify Ross in a manner as claimed. Thus, claim 1 is not obvious based on the teachings and suggestions of Ross.

Since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by Ross, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ross. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-10 also patentably distinguish over Ross and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to recite a method for selecting and printing one or more documents accessible via a communication network at a printing site comprising, in response to a user interacting with a printing device, causing the printing device to initiate a retrieval request for a selected document stored on a computing system, transferring the document to the printing device based on the retrieval request from the printing device, and printing the document on the printing device. No new matter has been added as Fig. 3 and pages 13 through 15, among other places, provide support therefor.

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ross. Again, Ross is directly converse to claim 11. The user in Ross interacts with either the customer console or the clerk console to print the document, not the printing device as required by claim 11. Additionally, the customer console or the clerk console initiates the request to retrieve the document, not the printing device as required by claim 11. Thus, Ross does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's claim 11, either explicitly or implicitly.

Since claim 11 recites features not taught or suggested by Ross, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Ross. Accordingly, dependent claims 12-17 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a printing device for selecting and printing one or more documents comprising means for selecting and causing a document to be retrieved from a remote device where the means for selecting and causing is configured within the printing device, means for transferring the document to the printing device, and means for causing the printing device to print. No new matter has been added as Fig. 3 and pages 13 through 15, among other places, provide support therefor.

The Office Action rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ross. As previously described, Ross only describes a traditional printer that prints books. Ross' printing device is void of any sort of means for selecting and causing a document to be retrieved from a remote device and a means for transferring the document, as required by claim 18. The document to be printed in Ross is selected and transferred to the printing device (26, 28) by the customer console (36), not the printing device (26 or 28). Thus, Ross does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 18, either explicitly or inherently.

Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Ross and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent claim 19 also patentably distinguishes over Ross and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 20

New Claim 20 is directed to a printing device and recites a printing device comprising a control interface for allowing a user to select a document and cause the document to be retrieved from a remote device. Fig. 3 and pages 13 through 15 of the present application, among other places, provide support for the claim 20. Thus, no new matter has been added.

As previously described, the printing devices (26, 28, 147, 149) in Ross are not configured to perform or suggest the claimed features of claim 20. Particularly, the printing devices as taught by Ross are nothing more than traditional printers. Ross' printing devices are void of any sort of feature for allowing a user to select a document and cause the document to be

retrieved from a remote device as claimed. Thus, Ross does not teach or suggest the features of claim 20, either explicitly or inherently.

Since claim 20 recites features not taught or suggested by Ross, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over Ross.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-20** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JAN. 3, 2005
Date

Petar Kraguljac
PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843